

RECEIVED

MAY 04 2000

Shan Lan Farm  
1902 Halverstick Road  
Lynden, WA 98264  
May 1, 2000

Allen J. Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
PO Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL  
re Sumas Energy 2 DEIS

Air quality is of utmost concern for people and domestic animals and wildlife. We cannot choose the air we breathe. Toxic emissions into the air of arsenic, ammonia, benzene, formaldehyde, lead and Particulate mater, called PM 10, would cause illness and even death to living beings. The DEIS does not include any information to curb these pollutants. The "most stringent control technology" is not defined in detail as to how such technology could prohibit the toxic emissions into the air. The residents of the south part of British Columbia would be adversely affected by the air emissions and they are furious with the proponents of Sumas Energy 2. The location of the proposed plant in a low river valley which is near a mountain range leaves little opportunity for the air to be blown away. Air quality data in 1996, 1997 and 1998 from the Abbotsford air station is not at all similar to the air quality in the valley five miles east of this airport. Particulate materials from the existing Sumas Energy 1 settle on picnic benches of nearby residents and is of concern to our health without adding a plant which would have three times more toxic air emissions. No suggestions are proposed to mitigate fogging and icing.

1

2

If this company is permitted to exist prior to adopting new regulations which have been in the progress of being required for 3½ years, Sumas Energy 2 would be grandfathered in under the old levels and would be able to continue polluting legally for the life of the proposed plant. It is to be criticized that the comment period was allowed before the DEIS was published. This was an attempt to avoid public scrutiny by speeding up the process.

3

Page 2-11 says that there might be 400 construction workers for 4 months. This is much different from the statement that 200-400 workers would be needed for 3 years. There is no job security for temporary construction work.

4

It is a concern that degraded surface and groundwater could result from runoff at the proposed plant site. Wetlands should not be filled in with gravel and paved over because the flood danger to other places in the valley would be worse.

5

Accidental chemical spills are a concern. These are another reason for not allowing the plant to be built. "Temporary noise from construction activities would occur during daytime hours." This statement does not say that during the operation of the proposed plant there would be noise levels continuously which would be twice as loud as the levels that interfere with sleep.

6

7

Nothing is suggested to offset the drawdown of operating water levels in domestic wells and wells used for dairying. Deeper wells and greater pumping requirements are suggested but this is a tremendous use of water by a proposed plant which is not needed to produce electricity for use in Whatcom County but for sale on the "open market." The potential longterm effects on baseflow of local streams due to lowering the water table cannot be quantified. This is a serious matter.

8

9

The risk of harming the aquifer by an accidental spill from the proposed 2.5 million gallon oil tank is a reason for not allowing the plant to be built. As part of the citizens' right to know act, it is needed to have material safety data sheets regarding all of these chemicals so that we will know the hazards.

10

The citizens of our neighbor country to the north should not be subjected to the pollutants. Nor should they risk hazards caused by high transmission lines in their neighborhoods. Various studies in Denver and in Snohomish County, Washington, have convinced me that cancer is caused by electro-magnetic

11

fields.

Yours truly,

*Elerine Shields*

Elerine Shields